

3125. b. 42.

REMARKS
ON A
PRINTED PAPER,
LATELY HANDED ABOUT,
INTITULED,

“ A Catalogue of the Sacred Vessels restored by Cy-
“ *rus*; and of the *Chief Jews*, who returned at first
“ from the Captivity; together with the Names of the
“ returning *Families*, and the *Number* of the Persons
“ at that Time in each Family: Disposed in such a
“ Manner, as to shew most clearly the great Cor-
“ ruption of *Proper Names* and *Numbers* in the pre-
“ sent Text of the Old-Testament.”

Addressed to all such GENTLEMEN as have received
or read the same.

THE SECOND EDITION.

By GRANVILLE SHARP. *K*

L O N D O N:

Printed for B. WHITE, at HORACE'S-HEAD,
FLEET-STREET.

M.DCC.LXXV.

REMARKS

PRINTED AT THE

PRINTING OFFICE

OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM
AND
THE
MUSEUM OF
COMPARATIVE ANATOMY
AND
ZOOLOGY
IN
LONDON



THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

AND

MUSEUM OF COMPARATIVE ANATOMY AND ZOOLOGY

IN

LONDON

REMARKS

ON A

PRINTED PAPER, &c.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING received from a worthy Friend in the country, for whom I have the greatest esteem, a printed paper, which had been sent him by Dr. Kennicott, intituled, “ A Catalogue of the *Sacred Vessels* restored by *Cyrus*; and of the *Chief Jews* who returned at first from the Captivity, together with the Names of the returning *Families*, and the *Number* of the *Persons* at that Time in each Family; disposed in such a manner, as to shew

A 2

“ most

“ most clearly the great corruption of
 “ *Proper Names and Numbers* in the pre-
 “ sent Text of the Old-Testament ;”
 and being desired to return the said paper
 when I had perused it, I thought I could
 not handsomely do so without sending
 my opinion of it at the same time. The
 nature of the subject is indeed so foreign
 to my own business and way of life, that
 I should scarcely have presumed to med-
 dle with it, had not a point of good man-
 ners to this Gentleman first of all induced
 me to do so ; but afterwards, when I had
 considered Dr. Kennicott’s manner of ex-
 pressing himself in the title of this cata-
 logue, I thought myself obliged, through
 a desire of vindicating the Holy Scrip-
 tures, to apply as closely to the examina-
 tion of this charge against them, as my
 small share of leisure would permit ; be-
 ing apprehensive that this paper might
 cause such prejudices against the integrity
 of the Text of the Old-Testament, as the
 learned

learned Author himself, perhaps, never conceived, and would be sorry to have occasioned by his catalogue.

The Letter to my friend, which was the result of this examination, was at my desire shewn to Dr. Kennicott; but the arguments therein had not sufficient weight to convince him, that some apology was necessary to be made to his friends, to prevent their misinterpreting his real design in the said catalogue, and to remove all appearance of his having charged "*the present Text of the Old-Testament*" with more faults than it really deserves. Not being able however to lay aside my own apprehensions of the ill effects which might possibly be occasioned by this catalogue, I have therefore ventured to print some of my remarks upon it, lest any person, not having leisure to examine it sufficiently, should be led to conceive, that all the differences in
names

names and numbers, found therein, are really corruptions "*in the present Text*" "*of the Old-Testament.*"

In the first part of the Catalogue the Doctor has compared Ezra's account of the sacred vessels with the account given of the same in the Book of Esdras; and, as if he had *clearly shewn* thereby some great corruptions, he has affixed the following motto to his quotations; viz. "non potest verum asseri, quod (1) ita diversum est."

But

(1) In the letter, which I sent to my friend on this subject, I endeavoured to shew, that a disagreement in numbers, when the accounts of historians are compared, is not a sufficient authority to justify a charge of corruption; and I supposed an example of two historians giving an account of the number of slain in a battle; the one that 1000 men were killed, and the other that no less than 2000 were lost in the same battle; and I observed, that, if the account is true of 2000 being killed, the other account cannot be called a contradiction to it, because a less number is mentioned therein; and this I thought sufficient to exemplify, that a smaller

But this account of Efdras is not “ita
“diversum” as to amount to a contra-
diction

smaller number, when given *without an absolute limitation*, is no contradiction to a greater number. But it has been objected to this example, that it is *by no means parallel to the case in question, because the numbers of slain in battle in large armies, as given by Historians, are, from the nature of the thing, hardly ever to be depended upon; whereas, when an inventory of goods is given, it is reasonably supposed to be exact to an unit, because it easily may be so.* I will therefore mention another example, not liable to the same objection, and more proper to be inserted in these remarks because it is quoted by Dr. Kennicott, (see page 53 2 of his 1st dissertation,) viz. “*In 1 Kings iv. 26. we read that Solomon had 40,000 stalls for horses, but in 2 Chr. ix. 25. only 4,000.*” This Dr. Kennicott mentions as one of the instances of mistakes which “*are most easily accounted for, by admitting the addition, omission, or transposition of a cypher:*” and the Doctor’s favourite Author, Father Houbigant, thinks to remove all difficulty from the same by altering the Text in 1 Kings iv. 26. from אֵלֶּף אַרְבַּעִים to אַרְבַּעָה אֵלֶּף viz. from 40,000 to 4,000.

But the ingenious Author of a small MS. book, lent me by a worthy and learned friend, (to whom I have great obligation on this, as well as many other accounts,) makes it appear very plainly, that the opinions of Bochart and Lud. Capellus (who think the word אַרְבַּעִים instead of 40 should be translated 4) would cause greater difficulties than what are at present found in the Text; for, says he, “let this Rabbinical use
“of plural ordinal numbers be what they please; yet
“in

dition of the other, and therefore the doctor's motto is not at all applicable.

For

“ in the Scripture Style they are never taken singular-
 “ ly, and this I affirm after having examined some
 “ hundreds of places, where they are either joined
 “ with appellatives, persons, or things, or greater
 “ numbers, as an hundred or thousand : and so these
 “ Hebrew words ארבעים אלף signify 40,000 be-
 “ yond exception in all other Texts they are found in ;
 “ and so the LXX. turn them here, and *Josephus* pre-
 “ serves the same high number.” He then proceeds to
 shew the great probability (“ *from the Riches and Gran-*
 “ *deur of Solomon*, and the more terrible execution a
 “ *Quadriga* would make than a *Big*,”) that *Solomon's*
 Chariots were drawn by 4 horses ; which opinion he
 supports by a variety of quotations and learned argu-
 ments ; and afterwards observes, that, as *Solomon* had
 1400 Chariots, (1 *Kings* x. 26. and 2 *Chron.* i. 14.)
 the number of horses, allowing 4 to each chariot, would
 require 5600 Stalls, besides the Stalls necessary for the
 12,000 single Troop Horses ; which numbers will oc-
 casion great difficulties if we suppose that *Solomon* had
 only 4000 Stalls. He also observes, that (besides the
 Stalls necessary for *Solomon's* standing forces) standings
 were necessary for horses presented to him by foreign
 Princes, as also for Baggage Mules and Dromedaries,
 which must be very numerous, not only for the carriage
 of provisions, tents, and other warlike necessaries both
 for horse and foot, but also for water, in the vast sandy
 wild of Arabia Deserta as far as Euphrates. Moreover,
 he observes, that as *Solomon* trafficked by his mer-
 chants with horses brought out of Egypt, furnishing
 the

For *Ezra* might at one time make particular mention of such Vessels only as were

B

perhaps

the Kings of Syria and the Hittites; “*so this running trade might occasion these stalls to be so numerous, not only serving the purposes of war, but of traffick.*” Many more reasons are given by the same Author, which are confirmed by a great variety of learned quotations and authorities; but, I trust, that those few I have mentioned are quite sufficient to prove that Father *Houbigant* has been much too hasty in altering the Sacred Text from 40,000 to 4000, and that he has thereby loaded it with a real difficulty, when he might have avoided the imaginary one, by admitting a very reasonable and fair solution, which has been approved of by a great variety of learned commentators; I mean that of construing the word אָרִיֹוֹת (not Stalls, but) Stables; which intirely removes all the difficulty: for, supposing each Stable capable of containing 10 Horses, you very easily account for the number of 40,000 Stalls: and this opinion is approved of by Abarbinel, Junius, and Tremellius, Bp. Patrick, Sir Walter Raleigh, Mons. Martin, and a great variety of other Commentators.

Some have indeed supposed, that the chariot Horses, spoken of in the parallel passage in 2d Chronicles ix. 25. were but 4000, which King Solomon kept at or near Jerusalem for his constant guard, and that the other speaks of those which were dispersed throughout his whole kingdom.

But what is most material to my purpose is observed by the author of the little treatise above-mentioned; viz. “*the diversity between these two relations* (viz. in
“ 1 Kings

perhaps (2) chiefly used, or were most remarkable, and might mean to include all

“ 1 Kings iv. 26, and 2 Chron. ix. 25.) amounts to “ 36,000; but, if the first account is proved true,” (which he most clearly has done,) “ *the second must be so too, as the less is included in the greater number.*” Now this is the very conclusion that I drew from my former example, (viz. of the two historians giving different accounts of the number of men slain in a battle,) which was objected to: and this is another reason for my having quoted this example of Solomon’s Horses; and I have the more pleasure in doing so, because it is not liable to the same objection as the former, for the numbers therein may as *reasonably be supposed to be exact to a unit* as the account of any *other inventory* whatever, because it easily might have been so: we find likewise that the difficulty therein may reasonably be accounted for without the supposition of a *mistake*, or the necessity of having recourse to Father Houbigant’s dangerous and unwarrantable expedient of altering the text.

(2) A very apt and ingenious objection has been made to this argument, and communicated to the writer of these Remarks; who hopes that the worthy and learned Author will excuse his inserting it here at length, as the omission of it in this place might perhaps be deemed an injustice to the subject in question. The Objection was as follows; “ That Ezra did not “ mean to mention particularly the chief vessels only, “ and then to include the rest in the general round Sum “ 5400, is evident from hence, that he does do this before he comes to make up the Sum 5400; for he throws “ together all the Vessels, not before specified, under “ the

all the rest in the *general round* Sum of 5400; and yet might afterwards think

B 2

proper

“ the article *other Vessels*, and into the general round
 “ Sum 1000 : and this round Sum 1000, added to the
 “ particular Sums before specified, ought, in common
 “ sense, to make the Sum total ; which here it does
 “ not do.”

But, notwithstanding the seeming propriety of this objection, yet, while there is any reasonable way left of accounting for a difficulty, we ought to be very cautious of supposing a corruption ; not from any idea of the *absolute Integrity* of the Hebrew Text, but because many very learned and experienced persons have led themselves and others into errors by esteeming some difficult passages to be corrupt, when the truth and integrity of the same might have been very sufficiently vindicated.

In the present case, though I have not met with any thing, which, in my opinion, ought to be adopted as the only true interpretation, yet I think that one of the solutions given by Bp. Patrick is so far reasonable, that it removes the absolute necessity of supposing a corruption, viz. “ *It is said, in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 18. Nebuchadnezzar carried away all the vessels both great and small. Now, in the account that is here given, the larger vessels only, which were of greater bigness and price, are mentioned.*” (Among which are also reckoned the 1000 other Vessels ; which round Sum was not intended to make up the gross, but only to include all the other great or larger Vessels, the species of which were not particularized, as Josephus testifies*, “ *σχευη*

“ *τε*

* And other great Vessels a thousand.

proper to write a more circumstantial history, setting down the *exact* number of each kind of vessel, together with the *particular* amount or total of the whole.

In *Josephus* the σπονδεια χρυσεα λ'. (30) and the φιαλαι χρυσιναι λ'. (30) correspond very well with the chargers of gold and basons of gold, mentioned by *Ezra*. As to the other numbers, they all differ, as well from the account in *Ezra*, as from that in *Esdra*s, except the 1000 other vessels; and the addition of the whole amounts to no more than 5210—yet, as he has not himself given a total number, he cannot be said to contradict either of the others. Now, as not one of the articles in the *Heb.* account of *Ezra* exceeds the numbers of those in *Esdra*s, there can be no contradiction therein, because each number may be included

“τι αλλα μεγαλα χιλια.”) “But the gross Sum comprehends all, both great and small, and amounts to the number 5400.”

included in the corresponding number in *Esdraſ*.

And farther; if the number of each article in *Exra* had been exactly the ſame with thoſe in *Eſdraſ*, the *Sum Total* 5400 would have appeared more like a miſtake; but, as they amount to no more than 2499, it is plain that the writer did not mean to enumerate every ſingle veſſel; becauſe he afterwards gives a *round Sum Total* of *even Hundreds*, viz. 5400, which is more frequent in Hiſtorians than exact and particular ſums: therefore a perſon muſt be very little acquainted with Hiſtory, who ſuppoſes that this is a contradiction to the *Sum Total* in *Eſdraſ*, becauſe *the odd number 69* is omitted (3).

As

(3) This numerical exactneſs in the Account of *Eſdraſ*, which is wanting in the Hebrew Account, has occaſioned a ſuppoſition that the latter, by ſome means
or

As to the difference of the names by which the Vessels are called, (however unlike they appear in the *English* Translation,) yet whoever is acquainted with the original Text must know that they correspond sufficiently; except indeed the *Heb.* word, which is translated *knives*; and that is capable of being construed several different ways, but there is not the

or other, has undergone some alteration. But it must be observed that some ancient copies of the book of Esdras have been *equally exact* in making the Sum total the amount of the several sorts of vessels to a unit, notwithstanding that the particulars are very different, and that the Sum total exceeds the common reading by 391 vessels. The old Latin Bibles, from which the present Vulgate was taken, have the reading just mentioned, which was probably translated from MSS. as ancient as those from which the present Greek Text of Esdras was taken: and the same reading is found in Tindal's old English Bible, printed in 1549. Therefore this numerical exactness is not a sufficient proof of the authenticity of the book of Esdras in this place; so that if the Heb. of Ezra was to be corrected by it to the same numerical exactness, and if *such other* corrections as have been proposed were to take place in the Text of the Old-Testament, I am apt to think that our Holy Bible itself would soon, by too many, be esteemed as little better than apocryphal.

the least reason to suppose that it has been corrupted.

The next thing that I have to observe is, that Dr. K. has been particularly unfortunate in fixing upon this part of the sacred History as a proof of *the great corruption of the proper names and numbers in the present Text of the Old-Testament.* First,

Because it was the custom of the *Babylonians* to give new Names to their captives; so that it was very common among the *Jewish* Captives to be called by two names: of this the Book of *Daniel* gives sufficient proof; and therefore this difference is of the less consequence, because two different names may mean the same person.

And, Secondly, because these three Books all agree in the sum total of persons;

sons (4); viz. 42,360; and yet none of their accounts amount to that sum by
upwards

(4) This agreement of the three Books in the sum total of Persons has occasioned a supposition, "that the Catalogue in all three was originally the same; and that all three are now imperfect in some of the particulars, since the particulars in none of them now amount to the sum 42,360, which is said to be the sum of each." But there is no proof that the list, which Nehemiah found, was exactly the same with that from which Ezra copied; for many different accounts might have been taken by the Persons appointed to number the people, even under the same title of *the Children of the Province that went up out of Captivity*, &c. and though they might find it very easy to agree in the sum total, *even to a unit*, by reckoning the people, promiscuously, by fifties, hundreds, or thousands, (in which method the want of pedigrees would cause no difficulty,) yet in taking the numbers of the families separately they might be very liable to differ, on account of the difficulty of ascertaining the legitimacy of some particular persons in many of the said Families.

It must be observed too, that not one of the three lists mentions the number of Priests, who were rejected for want of proper Registers, though the names of their families are the very last in each list, just preceding the Sum total; so that there is no doubt but that they are included therein notwithstanding: therefore, as the consent of all three informs us, beyond contradiction, of the real Sum total, so the want of the number of these Priests in all three lists seems as clearly to prove that the particular numbers in each were *not intended* to make up exactly

upwards of 8000: so that were the names and numbers, which are particularized in each book, much more different than they really are, they could not with justice be accused of contradiction; because there is sufficient room left in any of these histories for the mention of many different Families, which might have been omitted by the others.

Now those who content themselves with the Doctor's Catalogue, without farther examination, may indeed imagine, that he has shewn them *most clear-*

C ly

exactly the said Sum total; because it must otherwise seem very unaccountable, that all these three Lists, as well as all the ancient versions, which have been made from them, should happen to be corrupted in the same identical place.

Dr. Kennicott seemed to be aware of this objection, when he first *published* his Catalogue of names in his second Dissertation, page 508, &c. for he has there omitted these three last names, which have no numbers specified, though he has thought fit to add them to his second Edition in the printed sheet; because he must have been convinced, that they ought to be included in the Sum total, notwithstanding the triple evidence of these Lists, that *no number ought to be added*

ly some great corruptions of proper names, &c. because he has "*disposed them in such a manner*" as to compare the name *Bezai* in *Ezra* with *Hasfum* in *Nebemiah*: and again, *Jorab* in *Ezra* with *Bezai* in *Nebemiah*, which should have been placed in the line above; also *Hasfum* in *Ezra* (which should have been placed two lines higher) with *Hariph* in *Nebemiah*. Likewise he has placed *Lod* opposite to *Jericho*, *Hadid* to *Lod*, *Ono* to *Hadid*, and *Jericho* to *Ono*, each in a wrong line. So that he must either allow this to be a great mistake, or else that these names are "*disposed in such a manner*" as to prove nothing at all of what he pretends (5).

At

to the same; and, consequently, that the exact number 42,360 was never intended to be made appear from the addition of the particular Sums in any of these Lists.

(5) By way of excuse for Dr. Kennicott, it has been urged, that the names are taken in the order in which they stand in each writer, to shew how the order of the original Catalogue has been disturbed, and that he did not intend to compare those names, which are manifestly different, as if meant for the same person: but as

no

At the head of the names the Doctor has placed a Title, *viz.* "*The Twelve Chief Men,*" by which people may unwarily be led to suppose that the chief men were confined to the limited number of Twelve; but the Scriptures make no mention of a limited number of Chief Men (6), but only of names: therefore it is not an inconsistency in the account of *Exra* to mention only Eleven names. On this account, likewise, the difference in the names is of less consequence, because it is not easy to prove that different persons were not intended to have been

C 2

expressed

no sufficient evidence has ever yet been produced, that the order of the names has really been disturbed, in any of the Lists, from what it was when written by the Authors of each; and as I have, in a former note, shewn a probability, that the Catalogue in all three Lists *was not originally exactly the same*; and as this seems to be proved by these very variations in the order of the names; therefore I think that the Doctor's *manner of disposing* the names cannot with justice be defended.

(6) Dr. Kennicott nevertheless informs us, in page 508, (Second Dissertation,) that the *twelve Chiefs* represented the *twelve Tribes*.

expressed thereby: on the other hand, it may be as difficult to prove that they were; though there is some appearance of a proof in one instance; viz. the names *Reelius* and *Roimus* in *Esdra* (if we consider the *Greek* manner of expressing *Hebrew* names) will answer very well to *Reelaiab* (רעליה) in *Ezra*, and *Raamiab* (רעמיה) in *Nehemiah*; which last names Dr. K. has compared together as supposing them to have been originally the same, though the similar names just mentioned in *Esdra* give us great reason to believe the contrary.

But, before I leave Dr. Kennicott's twelve Chief Men, I will endeavour to clear up another difficulty, and will now take his side of the question to prove, that he has done right in comparing *Rebum* in *Ezra* with *Nebum* in *Nehemiah* as the name of one man, notwithstanding the great difference between them in
found,

found, which may at first sight seem to favour my suggestion about different persons; and I shall have the more pleasure in doing this, because at the same time I shall *shew most clearly* that neither the one nor the other is corrupted. Now every person, who is tolerably acquainted with the Chaldee and Syriac tongues, must know, that N (נ) is frequently changed for R (ר) in words derived from the Hebrew, and therefore it is much more easy to believe that Nehemiah, like a Babylonian, wrote נחום for רחום (*Nehum* for *Rehum*) than to suppose that either of the words has been since corrupted.

Whatever difference there may be between Ezra and Nehemiah in numbers, (which are of less consequence, as both of them fall so far short of the total,) yet the difference in names is very immaterial, though Dr. Kennicott has “ *dis-*
“ *posed*

“posed them in such a manner” as to make it seem very considerable.

There is but *one name* (viz. Hariph) in all this *long list of Families*, mentioned by Nehemiah, which has any material difference from those mentioned by Ezra, and there are *but four names* in Ezra, viz. *Jorab, Magbish, Hagab, and Asnah*, which are not found in Nehemiah; therefore as there are no names in Nehemiah to compare with these last, excepting the single name *Hariph*, it is impossible for Dr. K. to prove *any corruption of names in the Hebrew text throughout this whole list of families*.

Perhaps the Doctor may imagine, that the difference of names in the Apocryphal Greek book of Esdras is a sufficient proof against the integrity of the Hebrew text of the other two; otherwise he must allow, that his Catalogue proves very
little

little in this article of names. But, supposing that these differences were real contradictions, (which they are not,) the suspicion of corruption must of course fall on the book of (7) Esdras. First, Because the two best Greek copies of this same book (viz. the Vatican and Alexandrian copies) differ very much from each other both in the names and numbers.

Secondly, Because it is not of equal authority with the others, being apocryphal, and therefore not received into the canon of the Scriptures.

And, Thirdly, Because two evidences against one, though they were all to be of equal authority, would undoubtedly gain the cause in this critical trial.

But

(7) See Dr. Kennicott's second Dissertation on the State of the Hebrew Text, pages 506 and 507, where he intirely gives up the authority of the Book of Esdras: so that its testimony ought to have but very little weight (especially with Dr. K. himself) in correcting the Text.

But I will now endeavour to shew that even the apocryphal Book of Esdras is not so widely different from the others as the Doctor has made them appear in his Catalogue; and of this I hope the few examples that follow will be a sufficient proof.

Verse 15. *Aterezias* is in the original Greek Ατηρ Εζεχιας, agreeable to the Hebrew *Ater-Hezekiah*.

Verse 18. *Bethsamos* is Βαιθασμωθ in the Alexandrian copy, which is very agreeable to the Hebrew of Nehemiah, בית עזמור *Bitbozmouth*, or *Bethazma-veth*.

Verse 20. *Gabdes* is Γαβδης, the genitive of Γαββα, agreeable to the Hebrew *Gaba*.

Verse 23. *Annaas* is Σαναας, agreeable to the Hebrew *Senaah*.

Verse 25.

Ver. 25. *Carme* appears very different from *Harim* in English, though they are in the original tongues apparently the same word; for the H, in *Harim*, (ח in חרם) being a rough aspirate, is frequently expressed by the χ in Greek, as ירחו *Iepiχω*.

Verse 28. *Jatal* is *Αταρ* in the original Greek, agreeable to the Hebrew.

Also *Teta* is *Ατητα*, which agrees very well with the Hebrew *Hatita*.

Sami is *Τωβις* in the Vatican copy, which agrees very well with the Hebrew *Shobai*, for ט by the Chaldæans and Syrians was frequently exchanged both for ט and ח: likewise the word *Zαλει*, as it is expressed in the Alexandrian copy, is agreeable to the Hebrew שבי.

Verse 29. *Graba* is *Αγαλα* in the Vatican copy, and *Αγαλα* in the Alexandrian,
D andrian,

andrian, agreeable to the Hebrew *Hagaba*.

Verse 30. *Acua* is *Ακκιδ* in the Greek, which is much nearer to *Akkub*.

Verse 31. *Airus* should be *Ιαιρος*, which is plainly derived from *רֵאִיָּה* (*Reaiah*) by prefixing the ' or I, a thing very common in Hebrew names. *Azia* should be *Οζια*, which very well corresponds with *נִזְיָא*, called in English *Uzza*.

Verse 32. *Charcus* in the original is in the genitive *Βαρχες*, and agrees well with *Barkos*.

Nasib is in the Vatican copy *Νασι*, which is sufficiently near to *Neziab*.

Verse 33. *Azaphion* is in the Alexandrian copy *Ασαφφιωθ*, which is much nearer to *Sophereth*.

Pharira

Pharira is in the Alexandrian copy $\Phi\alpha\rho\iota\delta\alpha$, agreeable to the Hebrew פרידא *Perida*; though the Greek Φ expresses the פ without dagesch.

Verse 38. *Addus*. The Doctor has had very little regard to the context, or he would not have placed this name opposite to *Barzillai*, in order to shew clearly a great corruption; for he might have been there informed, that *Addus* married *Augia* one of the daughters of *Berzelus*, and was named after his name. The word $\Phi\alpha\eta\zeta\alpha\lambda\delta\alpha\iota\alpha$ in the Vatican copy is rendered *Berzelus*, for the Chaldeans frequently changed the Hebrew פ into פ or ϕ .

I shall now endeavour to give you some proofs, that Dr. Kennicott has condemned the proper names and numbers of the *present Text of the Old-Testament*, as being greatly corrupt, without giving

himself the trouble (for any thing that appears in the catalogue to the contrary), even to examine the original text; and that he has contented himself with setting down the names and numbers merely as they occurred in the English translation.

This is not less injustice than if a judge were to condemn a prisoner merely from the report given of him by others, without permitting him to appear before him to answer for himself.

My proofs of the Doctor's having merely copied the English Version, I shall take out of the book of Esdras: because with that (I suppose) he meant to correct the Hebrew Text.

Verse 13. He has taken the name *Sadas*, and the number 3222 only from the English version; for in the Alexandrian

drian copy it is Αργαα (near to the Hebrew *Azgad*) 3622; and Αργαι 2322 in the Vatican copy: so that he trifles with the originals if he thinks in this manner to shew their corruptions.

Verse 14. He has placed the number 667 to Adonicam as in the English Version of Esdras, whereas the Vatican copy reads 637, and the Alexandrian 647.

Verse 16. *Ananias* is called Ανωις and Ανωιας in the original Greek.

Meterus is expressed by Βαιτηρος in the original Greek.

Verse 25. *Phasseron* in the English Version and the Doctor's catalogue has the number 1047, but in the Vatican copy it has 2047, and in the Alexandrian 2247. *Carme* as in the English Version 1017, whereas the Vatican copy has only 217, and the Alexandrian 2017.

Verse

Verse 37. *Ladan*, as in the English, which is *Δαλαν* in the original.

Lastly, the number of servants, 7347, is plainly a mistake copied from the English Version; for the original Greek, as well as the Syriac Version of the same, is agreeable to the Hebrew 7337.

Now as many of the seeming differences (which the reader, as Dr. Kennicott supposes in page 507, 2d Dissertation, will view with surprize) are not to be found in the original, but are occasioned by the Doctor's copying merely from the English Version; as many other differences in names are caused only by the changing of letters, according to the common Chaldæan mode of expressing Hebrew words, and therefore are not liable to the charge of corruption; and as the most material differences between Ezra and Nehemiah are made by the Doctor's having placed the names in the order

der in which they stand in each writer, which has caused him to compare names manifestly different, as if meant for the same person; so I must conclude (all these things considered) that not only the disposition of names, but the whole performance is intirely unfair, because the Doctor's motto leaves no room for allowances to be made for whatever may have occasioned the several seeming differences, but condemns them indiscriminately with a bold insinuation of falsehood, viz. *Non potest verum asseri quod ita diversum est.*

The Doctor in his printed Sheet has indeed placed this motto close by the side of his quotation from the apocryphal Book of *Esdras*, but it is plain that he intended thereby to censure the differences in the whole catalogue, because he prefixed the same unjust motto to his *first publication* of the Catalogue in his 2d Dissertation, p. 508.

I call

I call this motto unjust, not only because it is there applied indiscriminately to a quotation from two canonical Books of the Old-Testament, but because St. *Jerome's* authority is quoted for it, as if he had applied the same words, for the same purpose, to the Book of *Ezra*, though it appears very plainly by St. *Jerome's* preface to the said Book, that he was speaking only of differences in the various copies of *the Greek Version*, when he made use of those words.

But notwithstanding the many faults, which I have found in the writings of this Gentleman, yet I have a much better opinion of him, than to suppose, that he will ever endeavour to evade my censure of his Catalogue, by alledging that he did not mean by it to shew the corruptions of the original Text, but only of the common *English* Translation, which he has here copied word for word; and
that

that he meant the *English* Translation where he has mentioned *the present Text of the Old Testament*.

I say, notwithstanding the improbability that there is of the Doctor's ever seeking such an evasion, yet he must excuse me if I endeavour to guard against any sort of shifting-off from the point whatsoever.

Therefore I must observe, that the Text of any author cannot mean a *Translation*, especially when a person is speaking of corruptions in it; for the Corruption of any Text must mean some wilful or accidental alteration from the original copy of the Author.

No Person therefore, speaking concerning the corruption in a Translation of any Book, may say that they are corruptions of the *present Text* of the said book; be-

E

cause

cause at the same time perhaps the real and original text contains none of those faults which he complains of.

So that, should the Doctor have really only meant to expose some defects, which he might imagine he had discovered in the *English* Version, (though I cannot think that he intended any such thing by this Catalogue,) yet it must appear to the Eyes of all those who know him, and his present undertaking, as if these unjust censures were levelled at the Original Text itself.

There are many other things, I believe, which might be alledged against this Catalogue, but I shall only beg leave to trouble the reader with two more.

Though there might be many *Jewish* Families called after the names of places, as *Betlehem*, *Ramah*, *Jericho*, &c. yet
perhaps

perhaps Dr. K. may have difficulty to prove that any *Jewish* Families were called *Tel-melah*, *Telbarsa*, *Cherub*, and *Addan*, (*Immer* the next name being indeed an exception,) although he has placed them in his list of families under the running Title of "*The Children of.*"

Now, if he had attended to the context, even of the *English* Translation, he might have understood, that these were really the names of places, and not of families; for we are there informed, that the Families, afterwards mentioned, "which went up *from*" the said places, "sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found."

Another mistake he has likewise made in comparing *Cherub* and *Addan*, the names of places in *Ezra* and *Nebemiah*, with *Charaatbalar* and *Aalar*, the names

of men mentioned by *Esdra*s ; though the context plainly shews that there were no other than what I say.

I will not however insist on these two last articles, because I presume that I have before sufficiently proved, that this Catalogue *does* “ *not shew most clearly the great corruption of proper names and numbers in the present Text of the Old-Testament.*”

Now, lest my censure of this catalogue should seem to strike obliquely at Dr. Kennicott's present undertaking of collating the Heb. MSS. which has been honoured with the subscriptions of so many great and learned persons ; I think it necessary, for my own sake, as well as in justice to Dr. Kennicott, to declare, that I think his collation of Hebrew MSS. a very laudable and useful undertaking ; and that there cannot be the least objection to his new Edition

tion of the Heb. Bible, if printed according to the propofals offered by him in the year 1760; viz. (*“ not with a new Text, but) from one of the best Editions already published,”* having the various readings inserted at the bottom of every page.

I am,

Gentlemen,

Your most humble Servant,

GRANVILLE SHARP.

T H E E N D.

tion of the Heb. Bible is printed ac-
cording to the proposals offered by him in
the year 1760; viz. ("with a new
"Text; but) from one of the best Heb.
"now already published," having the
various readings inserted at the bottom
of every page.

Gentlemen,

Yours faithfully,



GRAHAM'S SHARP

THE END

